

REMARKS

Claims 1-30, 32-41, and 43-46 were pending in the application at the time of examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants earlier filed an Information Disclosure Statement and PTO Form 1449 on September 17, 2004. Applicants note that the Examiner failed to initial the consideration of U.S. Patent documents 6,012,098 to Bayeh et al. and 2002/0059344 to Britton et al. on the returned copy.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner send an initialed return copy of the PTO Form 1449 referenced above, and additionally consider and initial the previously uninitialed U.S. Patent documents 6,012,098 and 2002/0059344.

Claims 1-10, 35, and 46 are not obvious in view of and are patentable over the combination of Kanevsky and Stahl

In the Office Action, at page 2, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-10, 35, and 46 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky (USPN 6,300,947), hereinafter Kanevsky, in view of Stahl (USPN 7,072,932), hereinafter Stahl.

Claims 1 and 2-10

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejections of Claim 1 and dependent Claims 2-10.

Applicants' Claim 1 recites in part at least:

...receiving a request from said user device for said data, wherein said request includes at least a description of said data and information identifying presentation requirements of said user device;  
identifying said presentation requirements of said user device based on said information present in said request; and

selecting a presentation scheme specific to said user device for said data from a plurality of presentation schemes in accordance with said presentation requirements, wherein each presentation scheme in said plurality of presentation schemes is for a user device and is the totality of the configuration information needed to extract said data from a first format and transform said data into new data for presentation on a user device associated with said each presentation scheme, and further wherein upon application of said presentation scheme to said data, new data presentable on said user device is generated. (emphasis added)

In the Office Action, at pages 2-3, the Examiner stated:

...Although Kanevsky shows substantial features of the claimed invention including request message 102 and display mode message 103, he does not explicitly show where the request includes both a description of a data and information identifying presentation requirements. Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Kanevsky, as evidenced by Stahl USPN. (7,072,932).

In analogous art, Stahl whose invention is a personalized network-based services, disclose, "a user creates a user profile which includes requests for one or more customized sets of information. The user profile also specifies a preferred format and preferred time for delivery of each set of information. The information requests may include, for example, news...weather reports, traffic reports, daily calendar, reminders... and music..." [Col. 3, lines 13-21 and col. 4, lines 44-54].

Giving the teaching of Stahl, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and the advantage of modifying Kanevsky by employing the personalized network-based services system of Stahl so that customized sets of information are delivered to one or more user devices according to specific format and specific time desired by the user.

As recognized by the Examiner, Kanevsky does not describe or suggest at least "...wherein said request includes at least a description of said data and information identifying presentation requirements of said user device" as recited in part in Applicants' Claim 1 (emphasis added).

Further, with regard to the Examiner's citation to Stahl at col. 3, lines 13-21 and col. 4, lines 44-54, these citations merely describe that a user creates a user profile that is stored on a server that identifies customized sets of information requests which can be provided to the user in accordance with a user specified format and time.

Stahl at column 5, lines 32-37 describes:

The user generates a user profile by using the web portal server 208. The user profile specifies the list of information requests, and preferred formats and times for delivery of the information satisfying these requests. The user profile is stored either on access and control server 206 or on web portal server 208. (emphasis added)

Thus, the "information requests" described by Stahl are stored listings of user specified information to be provided to the user in accordance with the stored user profile and in accordance with the user specified format stored in the user profile.

Further, Stahl at col. 5, lines 52-55 describes:

ISP 103 also comprises a format-converting server 220 which facilitates the preparation of the desired information in the format specified by the user in the user profile. (emphasis added)

Thus, the information utilized in Stahl to select a format for the desired information is retrieved from a stored user profile earlier input by a user. Further, as the format is specified by the user in the profile, Stahl does not describe or suggest that the format is specific to a user device. Thus, again Stahl does not describe or suggest receiving a request from a user device, where the request includes at least a description of said data and information identifying presentation requirements of said user device.

Based on the above, Applicants submit that even if Kanevsky were combined with Stahl at most the combination would

describe that information present in a stored user profile is utilized to send user requested information at a user specified time and in a user specified format, and thus the combination does not describe or suggest at least "...receiving a request from said user device for said data, wherein said request includes at least a description of said data and information identifying presentation requirements of said user device" as recited in part in Applicants' Claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit Claim 1 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over Kanevsky in view of Stahl.

As Claims 2-10 depend from Claim 1, Applicants submit that for at least the same reasons presented above with regard to Claim 1, Claims 2-10 are also not obvious in view of and are patentable over Kanevsky and Stahl.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of Claims 1-10.

Claim 35

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of Claim 35.

Applicants' Claim 35 recites in part at least:

...receiving a request from a user device for data, wherein said request includes at least a description of said data and information identifying presentation requirements of said user device....

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the obviousness rejection of Claim 1, hereby incorporated by reference, Claim 35 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over Kanevsky and Stahl.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of Claim 35.

Claim 46

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of Claim 46.

Applicants' Claim 46 recites in part at least:

...receiving a request from said user device for said data, wherein said request includes at least a description of said data and information identifying presentation requirements of said user device....

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the obviousness rejection of Claim 1, hereby incorporated by reference, Claim 46 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over Kanevsky and Stahl.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of Claim 46.

Claims 11, 15-20, 27-28, 30, 34, 36, 39, 41 and 43-44 are not obvious in view of and are patentable over Kanevsky in view of Stahl

In the Office Action at page 5, the Examiner rejected Claims 11, 15-20, 27-28, 30, 34, 36, 39, 41 and 43-44 (and 45) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Kanevsky and Stahl.

Claims 11 and 15-20

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejections of independent Claim 11 and dependent Claims 15-20.

Claim 11 recites in part at least:

...receiving a request from a user device generated by selection of a portlet identification object on said user device, wherein said request includes at least a description of said data and information identifying presentation requirements of said user device....

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the obviousness rejection of Claim 1, hereby incorporated by reference, the combination of Kanevsky and Stahl do not describe or suggest at least the above recited element of Claim 11. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 11 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over Kanevsky and Stahl.

Claims 15-20 depend from Claim 11 and so distinguish over the combination of Kanevsky and Stahl for at least the same reasons as Claim 11.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of Claims 11 and 15-20.

Claims 27, 28, 30 and 34

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejections of independent Claim 27 and dependent Claims 28 and 34.

Claim 27 recites in part at least:

...an identifying module for identifying presentation requirements of a user device from information included in a request, wherein said request includes at least a description of said data and information identifying presentation requirements of said user device....

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the obviousness rejection of Claim 1, hereby incorporated by reference, the combination of Kanevsky and Stahl do not describe or suggest at least the above recited element of Claim 27. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 27 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over Kanevsky and Stahl.

Claims 28, 30 and 34 depend from Claim 27 and so distinguish over the combination of Kanevsky and Stahl for at least the same reasons as Claim 27.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of Claims 27, 28, 30, and 34.

Claims 36 and 39

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejections of independent Claim 36 and dependent Claim 39.

Claim 36 recites in part at least:

...receiving a request from a user device generated by selection of a portlet identification object on said user device, wherein said request includes at least a description of said data and information identifying presentation requirements of said user device....

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the obviousness rejection of Claim 1, hereby incorporated by reference, the combination of Kanevsky and Stahl do not describe or suggest at least the above recited element of Claim 36. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 36 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over Kanevsky and Stahl.

Claim 39 depends from Claim 36 and so distinguishes over the combination of Kanevsky and Stahl for at least the same reasons as Claim 36.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of Claims 36 and 39.

Claims 41 and 43-44

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejections of independent Claim 41 and dependent Claims 43 and 44.

Claim 41 recites in part at least:

...receiving a request from a user device to retrieve content associated with a portlet identifier, wherein said request includes at least a description of said content and information

identifying presentation requirements of said user device, said request generated by selection of said portlet identifier from a plurality of portlet identifiers displayed on said user device, each of said portlet identifiers representing a different portlet....

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the obviousness rejection of Claim 1, hereby incorporated by reference, the combination of Kanevsky and Stahl do not describe or suggest at least the above recited element of Claim 41. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 41 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over Kanevsky and Stahl.

Claims 43 and 44 depend from Claim 41 and so distinguish over the combination of Kanevsky and Stahl for at least the same reasons as Claim 41.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of Claims 41, 43, and 44.

#### Claim 45

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of independent Claim 45.

Claim 45 recites in part at least:

...identifying presentation requirements of said user device based on information included in at least one of said first request and said second request....

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the obviousness rejection of Claim 1, hereby incorporated by reference, the combination of Kanevsky and Stahl do not describe or suggest at least the above recited element of Claim 45. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 45 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over Kanevsky and Stahl.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of Claim 45.



Claim 29 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over Kanevsky and Stahl in view of Miller

In the Office Action, at page 9, the Examiner rejected Claim 29 as obvious and unpatentable over of Kanevsky and Stahl in view of Miller.

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of Claim 29.

Applicants submit that Claim 29 depends from Claim 27 and for at least the same reasons earlier presented with reference to the obviousness rejection Claim 27, hereby incorporated by reference, Claim 29 also distinguishes over Kanevsky and Stahl.

Miller

The cited reference to Miller describes that "the Resource Description Framework (RDF) is an infrastructure that enables the encoding, exchange and reuse of structured metadata." (Miller, Abstract).

Assuming the combination of Miller with Kanevsky and Stahl is proper, Miller would at most describe that another standard that supports metadata might be available on the web and perhaps the RDF could be user specified and stored as a stored user defined preference in the user profile of Stahl. Thus, even if the reference to Miller is combined with the references to Kanevsky and Stahl relied on by the Examiner, the combination fails to cure the deficiencies of Kanevsky and Stahl.

Based on the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 27 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over the combination of Miller and Kanevsky and Stahl.

Claim 29 depends from Claim 27 and so distinguishes over the combination of Miller and Kanevsky and Stahl for at least the same reasons as Claim 27.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of Claim 29.

Claims 12 and 22 are not obvious in view of and are patentable over Kanevsky and Stahl in view of Deach et al.

In the Office Action at page 10, Claims 12 and 22 were rejected as obvious and unpatentable over of Kanevsky and Stahl in view of Deach.

Claim 12

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of Claim 12.

Applicants submit that Claim 12 depends from Claim 11 and so distinguishes over the combination of Kanevsky and Stahl for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the obviousness rejections of Claims 1 and 11, hereby incorporated by reference.

Deach

The cited reference to Deach describes that XSL includes "a language for transforming XML documents" and "an XML vocabulary for specifying formatting semantics" (Deach page 1).

Assuming the combination of Deach with Kanevsky and Stahl is proper, Deach would at most describe that an XSL language might be available on the web, and perhaps this XSL language could be user specified and stored as a stored user defined preference in the user profile of Stahl. Thus, even if the reference to Deach is combined with the references to Kanevsky and Stahl relied on by the Examiner, the combination fails to cure the deficiencies of Kanevsky and Stahl.

Based on the above remarks, Applicants respectfully maintain that Claim 11 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over the combination of Deach and Kanevsky and Stahl.

Claim 12 depends from Claim 11 and so distinguishes over the combination of Deach and Kanevsky and Stahl for at least the same reasons as Claim 11.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of Claim 12.

Claim 22

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of Claim 22.

Applicants submit that Claim 12 depends from Claim 21 and so distinguishes over the combination of Kanevsky and Stahl for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the obviousness rejections of Claims 1 and 11, hereby incorporated by reference. Further for at least the same reasons presented above with regard to the obviousness rejection of Claim 12, the combination of Deach with Kanevsky and Stahl fails to cure the deficiencies of Kanevsky and Stahl.

Based on the above remarks, Applicants respectfully maintain that Claim 21 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over the combination of Deach and Kanevsky and Stahl.

Claim 22 depends from Claim 21 and so distinguishes over the combination of Deach and Kanevsky and Stahl for at least the same reasons as Claim 21.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of Claim 22.

Claims 13, 14, 21, 23-26, 37, 38, and 40 are not obvious in view of and are patentable over Kanevsky and Stahl in view of Freed et al.

In the Office Action at page 11, the Examiner rejected Claims 13, 14, 21, 23-26, 37, 38, and 40 as obvious and unpatentable over of Kanevsky and Stahl in view of Freed.

Claims 13 and 14

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejections of Claims 13 and 14.

Applicants submit that Claims 13 and 14 depend from Claim 11 and so distinguish over the combination of Kanevsky and Stahl for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the rejections of Claims 1 and 11, hereby incorporated by reference.

Freed

The cited reference to Freed describes "the various headers used to describe the structure of MIME messages" (Freed page 1). Assuming the combination of Freed with Kanevsky and Stahl is proper, Freed would at most describe that MIME message headers might be available on the web, and perhaps the MIME message headers could be user specified and stored in a stored user profile of Stahl.

Thus, even if the reference to Freed is combined with the references to Kanevsky and Stahl relied on by the Examiner, the combination fails to cure the deficiencies of Kanevsky and Stahl.

Based on the above remarks, Applicants respectfully maintain that Claim 11 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over the combination of Freed and Kanevsky and Stahl.

Claims 13 and 14 depend from Claim 11 and so distinguish over the combination of Freed and Kanevsky and Stahl for at least the same reasons as Claim 11.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of Claims 13 and 14.

Claims 21, 23-26, and 38

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejections of independent Claim 21 and dependent Claims 23-26, and 38.

Claim 21 recites in part at least:

...receiving a request from a user device  
generated by selection of a portlet identification

object on the user device by a web server, wherein said request includes at least a description of said data and information identifying presentation requirements of said user device....

Applicants submit that for at least the same reasons earlier presented in response to the obviousness rejection of Claim 1, hereby incorporated by reference, Claim 21 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over the combination of Kanevsky and Stahl.

Further, for at least the same reasons presented above in response to the obviousness rejections of Claims 13 and 14, hereby incorporated by reference, Claim 21 is not obvious and is patentable over the combination of Freed and Kanevsky and Stahl.

Claims 23-26, and 38 depend from Claim 21 and so distinguish over the combination of Freed and Kanevsky and Stahl for at least the same reasons as Claim 21.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of Claims 21, 23-26, and 38.

Claims 37 and 40

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejections of independent Claim 37 and dependent Claim 40.

Claim 37 recites in part at least:

...receiving a request from a user device generated by selection of a portlet identification object on the user device by a web server, wherein said request includes at least a description of said data and information identifying presentation requirements of said user device....

Applicants submit that for at least the same reasons earlier presented in response to the obviousness rejection of Claim 1, hereby incorporated by reference, Claim 37 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over the combination of Kanevsky and Stahl.

Further, for at least the same reasons presented above in response to the obviousness rejections of Claims 13 and 14, hereby incorporated by reference, Claim 37 is not obvious and is patentable over the combination of Freed and Kanevsky and Stahl.

Claim 40 depends from Claim 37 and so distinguishes over the combination of Freed and Kanevsky and Stahl for at least the same reasons as Claim 37.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of Claims 37 and 40.

Claims 32 and 33 are not obvious in view of and are patentable over Kanevsky and Stahl in view of Jones.

In the Office Action at page 13, the Examiner rejected Claims 32 and 33 as being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of Stahl and in view of Jones et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejections of Claims 32 and 33.

Applicants submit that Claims 32 and 33 depend from Claim 27 and so distinguish over the combination of Kanevsky and Stahl for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the rejections of Claims 1 and 27.

Jones

The cited reference to Jones describes "reasons for web-based management" of "messaging" (Jones, page 20). Assuming the combination of Jones with Kanevsky and Stahl is proper, Jones would at most describe that web-based messaging management might available on the web and perhaps the web-based management of messaging could be user specified and stored as a stored user defined preference in the user profile of Stahl. Thus, even if the reference to Jones is combined with the references to Kanevsky and Stahl relied on by the Examiner, the

combination fails to cure the deficiencies of Kanevsky and Stahl.

Based on the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 27 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over the combination of Jones, Kanevsky and Stahl.

Claims 32 and 33 depend from Claim 27 and so distinguish over the combination of Jones and Kanevsky and Stahl for at least the same reasons as Claim 27.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of Claim 32 and 33.

#### Conclusion


For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicants.

#### Request for Examiner Interview

Should the Examiner be of the opinion that this amendment does not place the Application in a condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request an Examiner interview prior to issuance of the next communication from the USPTO to expedite prosecution.


#### **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on March 5, 2007.

  
Attorney for Applicants

March 5, 2007  
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

  
Lisa A. Norris  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 44,976  
Tel.: (831) 655-0880